REMARKS

This response is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action of December 5, 2003 and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of the claims as set forth therein in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

This is a non-final Office Action. The previous Office Action of May 8, 2003 was issued by a different examiner. The current Office Action of December 5, 2003 has been issued again by the original examiner.

In the May 8, 2003 Office Action, the new Examiner objected to claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16 and 18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As a result, to enhance the recitation of the limitations of the present invention, the applicant rewrote claims 4, 10 and 16 into independent form.

In addition, claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) allegedly as being anticipated by Eda et al (US 5,387,888 - filed April 1, 1993 - issued February 7, 1995). To further enhance the recitation of the limitations of the present invention, the applicant changed the dependency of claims 2 and 5 to now independent claim 4, claims 8 and 11 to now independent claim 10, and claims 14 and 17 to now independent claim 16.

Now, the original Examiner has withdrawn the allowable subject matter of claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16 and 18 allegedly in view of a newly discovered

reference, Suzuki et al (US 4,707,671 - filed May 9, 1986 - issued November 17, 1987).

Prior to addressing the rejections over the prior art in the current Office Action, the applicant wishes to call to the Examiner's attention that, in order to further enhance the recitation of the limitations of the present invention, claims 4, 10 and 16 have been amended to define the ground line based on FIG. 1. Support for the amendments to claims 4, 10 and 16 is found in FIG. 1 which discloses that the ground line 10 is the combination of the first ground layer 1, the internal layer 2, and the second ground layer 3. As a result, no new matter has been added by the amendments to claims 4, 10 and 16.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections: Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eda et al in view of Suzuki et al.

With respect to claims 4, 10 and 16, the Examiner now alleges that Eda et al. disclose all of the claim limitations of an internal layer; a line formed in a first area of said internal layer, said line radiating unnecessary radiation; a first ground layer formed on an upper surface of said internal layer, said first ground layer disallowing radiation to pass therethrough; and a second ground layer formed on a lower surface of said internal layer, said second ground layer disallowing radiation to pass therethrough.

However, Eda et al. fail to disclose (e) a ground line formed in a second area except said first area in said internal layer, as recited by claims 4, 10 and 16, but the Examiner further alleges that Suzuki et al., FIG. 1, column 4, lines

35-44, discloses multiple ground lines (1_{a3}, 1_{b3}, ... 1_{g3},) disposed across the dielectric opposite signal lines, each conductor spaced apart from an adjacent ground line.

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eda et al to include multiple ground lines (i.e., reads on a second ground line) in different areas (i.e., reads on a second area except said first area) within an internal layer (e.g., between layer 3 {supporting insulators}) for the purpose of reducing the signal transmission loss.

In response, the applicant maintains that the limitations of claims 4, 10 and 16 recite a ground line comprising a first ground layer, an internal layer, and a second ground layer. In contrast, Eda et al disclose a dielectric layer, referred to as second dielectric layer 2', between top ground electrode 3 and electrical conduction line 7 and 7', and a first dielectric layer 2 between electrical conduction line 7 and 7' and bottom ground electrode 4, but not a ground line comprising a first ground layer, an internal layer, and a second ground layer.

Suzuki et al disclose only a film-shaped porous dielectric 2 between a plurality of pairs of signal lines 1a1,..., 1g2 and ground lines 1a3...1g3.

Therefore, neither Eda et al nor Suzuki et al, taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claims 4, 10 and 16 of a ground line comprising a first ground layer, an internal layer, and a second ground layer. As a result, claims 4, 10 and 16 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Consequently, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 over the prior art.

The foregoing Remarks establish the patentable nature of all of the claims remaining in the application, i.e., claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18. No new matter has been added, wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony N. Fresco

Anthony N. Fresco
Registration No.: 45,784

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343/4366 FAX

ANF:yd